

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated December 27, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-36, 39-44, and 47-57 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated December 27, 2006, Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-36, 39-44, and 47-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-36, 39-44, and 47-58 remain in this application, with new Claim 58 being added by this amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection the Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-32, 41-44, and 47-55 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated December 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-11, 13-17, 27-32, and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,259,782 ("*Gallant*") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0072593 A1 ("*Robbins*"). In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 47-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Robbins* in view of *Gallant*. Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "means for interfacing with a data switch, wherein the data switch including programming means to respond to a routing information in a layer

of a switching protocol to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset." Amended Claims 8, 27, and 47 each includes a similar recitation. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 20, lines 17-25.

Consistent with embodiments of the claimed invention, in order to provide a functionality for utilizing a single telephone number with multiple handsets, an interface may be provided between an unregulated wireless network, a regulated wireless network, and a public switch telephone network. (See specification, page 20, lines 17-19.) For example, a media gateway may interface with a signal transfer point (STP) within the public switch telephone network via a communication link. (See specification, page 20, lines 19-20.) The communication link may employ, for example, signaling system 7 (SS7) switching protocol. (See specification, page 20, lines 21.) The STP may be a multi-port high speed packet switch that may be programmed to respond to routing information in an appropriate layer of the switching protocol and to route data packets to their intended destinations. (See specification, page 20, lines 21-24.)

In contrast, *Gallant* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Gallant* merely discloses that each wireless terminal 110 has a wireless terminal identification number 112 that has a mobile identification number (MIN), thus, each wireless device has a separate and unique telephone number. (See col. 5, lines 31-45.) In *Gallant*, wireline terminals can be employed that also have their own unique telephone numbers. (See col. 5, lines 21-29.) On top of these separate telephone numbers, *Gallant* then deploys a permanent telephone number 180 and defines calling logic on how to route a call directed to that number onto the telephone numbers for any

of the wireline or wireless terminals. (See col. 6, lines 56-58) Consequently, *Gallant* does not disclose interfacing with a signal transfer point (STP), to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset. In *Gallant*, a request message is sent to a database management system of a global location register. *Gallant's* message requests routing instructions for completing a call to a telephone number.

Furthermore, *Robbins* does not overcome *Gallant's* deficiencies. *Robbins* merely discloses that a user can enter and/or select rules for processing or handling calls based upon, for example, an originating caller, time and/or day of a call, whether a user is currently utilizing a desk phone or a subscriber device and whether the user is within a WLAN or a cellular network. (See paragraph [0062], lines 12-17.) A soft switch 134, in *Robbins*, can access a contact list and use categories and rules for call processing. (See paragraph [0062], lines 17-18.) For example, *Robbins's* soft switch 134 can use the contact list and categories to determine whether to route a call to a dual mode subscriber device 130, such as based on time of day, caller identity, a location of a dual mode remote unit, a location of the user and the like. (See paragraph [0062], lines 18-23.) A desk phone 136 can include a docking station for dual mode subscriber device 130, battery charging sockets, and the like. (See paragraph [0062], lines 23-27.) In addition, desk phone 136 can incorporate access point functionality so that it is also a portion of a WLAN 132. (See paragraph [0062], lines 27-30.) In one mode, *Robbins's* soft switch 134 rings desk phone 136 for all incoming calls regardless of whether it rings dual mode subscriber device 130. (See paragraph [0062], lines 30-32.) Consequently, *Robbins* does not disclose interfacing with a signal transfer point (STP), to route data

packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset. In *Robbins*, a user enters rules for processing or handling calls.

Combining *Gallant* with *Robbins* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Gallant* and *Robbins*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "means for interfacing with a data switch, wherein the data switch including programming means to respond to a routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 8, 27, and 47 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47.

Dependent Claims 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 28-32, 41-44, and 48-55 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 8, 27, and 47. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-7, 9-11, 13-17, 28-32, 41-44, and 48-55

II. Rejection of Claims 33-36, 39-40, and 56-57 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 33-36, 39-40, and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gallant* in view of *Robbins* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,922,559 ("*Mohammed*"). Dependent Claims 33-34, are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, "means for interfacing with

a data switch, wherein the data switch including programming means to respond to a routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset.” Dependent Claims 35-36, 39-40, and 56-57 each includes a similar recitation.

As stated above, consistent with embodiments of the claimed invention, in order to provide a functionality for utilizing a single telephone number with multiple handsets, an interface may be provided between an unregulated wireless network, a regulated wireless network, and a public switch telephone network. (See specification, page 20, lines 17-19.) For example, a media gateway may interface with a signal transfer point (STP) within the public switch telephone network via a communication link. (See specification, page 20, lines 19-20.) The communication link may employ, for example, signaling system 7 (SS7) switching protocol. (See specification, page 20, lines 21.) The STP may be a multi-port high speed packet switch that may be programmed to respond to routing information in an appropriate layer of the switching protocol and to route data packets to their intended destinations. (See specification, page 20, lines 21-24.)

In contrast, *Gallant* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Gallant* merely discloses that each wireless terminal 110 has a wireless terminal identification number 112 that has a mobile identification number (MIN), thus, each wireless device has a separate and unique telephone number. (See col. 5, lines 31-45.) In *Gallant*, wireline terminals can be employed that also have their own unique telephone numbers. (See col. 5, lines 21-29.) On top of these separate telephone numbers, *Gallant* then deploys a permanent telephone number 180 and defines calling

logic on how to route a call directed to that number onto the telephone numbers for any of the wireline or wireless terminals. (See col. 6, lines 56-58) Consequently, *Gallant* does not disclose interfacing with a signal transfer point (STP), to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset. In *Gallant*, a request message is sent to a database management system of a global location register. *Gallant's* message requests routing instructions for completing a call to a telephone number.

Robbins does not overcome *Gallant's* deficiencies. *Robbins* merely discloses that a user can enter and/or select rules for processing or handling calls based upon, for example, an originating caller, time and/or day of a call, whether a user is currently utilizing a desk phone or a subscriber device and whether the user is within a WLAN or a cellular network. (See paragraph [0062], lines 12-17.) A soft switch 134, in *Robbins*, can access a contact list and use categories and rules for call processing. (See paragraph [0062], lines 17-18.) For example, *Robbins's* soft switch 134 can use the contact list and categories to determine whether to route a call to a dual mode subscriber device 130, such as based on time of day, caller identity, a location of a dual mode remote unit, a location of the user and the like. (See paragraph [0062], lines 18-23.) A desk phone 136 can include a docking station for dual mode subscriber device 130, battery charging sockets, and the like. (See paragraph [0062], lines 23-27.) In addition, desk phone 136 can incorporate access point functionality so that it is also a portion of a WLAN 132. (See paragraph [0062], lines 27-30.) In one mode, *Robbins's* soft switch 134 rings desk phone 136 for all incoming calls regardless of whether it rings dual mode subscriber device 130. (See paragraph [0062], lines 30-32.) Consequently,

Robbins does not disclose interfacing with a signal transfer point (STP), to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset. In *Robbins*, a user enters rules for processing or handling calls.

Furthermore, *Mohammed* does not overcome *Gallant's* and *Robbins'* deficiencies. *Mohammed* merely discloses that a base station 18 wirelessly transmits telephone signals from a standard public switched telephone network (PSTN) 20 and, if necessary, a standard private branch exchange (PBX) 22, to a subscriber device 12. (See col. 3, lines 46-49.) Specifically, *Mohammed* discloses that when device 12 is within an unlicensed wireless service coverage area 16, originating base station 18 provides device 12 with wireless telephone service originating from PSTN 20 rather than a cellular network 14. (See col. 3, lines 49-53.) Consequently, *Mohammed* does not disclose interfacing with a signal transfer point (STP), to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset. In *Mohammed*, base station 18 wirelessly transmits telephone signals from standard public switched telephone network (PSTN) 20 to a subscriber device.

Combining *Gallant* with *Robbins* and *Mohammed* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Gallant*, *Robbins*, and *Mohammed*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "means for interfacing with a data switch, wherein the data switch including programming means to respond to a routing information in a layer of a switching protocol to route data packets to the at least one of the first handset and the second handset," as included in dependent Claims 33-34. Dependent Claims 35-36, 39-40, and 56-57 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, dependent Claims 33-36, 39-40, and 56-57 patentably distinguish the present invention over the

cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 33-36, 39-40, and 56-57.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: March 27, 2007

DKS:ARL:mdc


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE